

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claim 7 is currently being amended.

Claim 19 is currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 7-10, 16 and 19 are now pending in this application.

**Indication of Allowable Subject Matter:**

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter made in the Office Action with respect to claims 8 and 9.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,658,250 to Ganesan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,812,548 to Havermans et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,592; and claims 10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganesan et al. in view of Havermans et al. and Bik, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,538 to Sugar. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 7, the Office Action asserts that the transmit buffer 45 as shown in Figure 3 of Ganesan et al. corresponds to the claimed plurality of reception buffer stages. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Namely, as described in column 5, lines 17-20 of Ganesan et al., an ADSPCM signal enters a transmit buffer 45, whereby the digital signal is temporarily stored there, for later transfer to a channel encoder 44. Clearly, based on this description and from Figure 3, **a single transmit buffer 45 cannot correspond to a**

**plurality of reception buffer stages.** Also, the claimed reception buffer stages receive data from the asynchronous transmission line, whereby, in the combined system of Ganesan et al. and Havermans et al., the transmit buffer 45 would receive data from a transmission line that has both synchronous slots and asynchronous slots. In other words, in the combined system of Ganesan and Havermans, the transmit buffer 15 would receive both asynchronous data and synchronous data. These distinctions are made further clear in new dependent claim 19, whereby the reception buffer stages only receive data from the asynchronous transmission line, which cannot happen in the combined system of Ganesan and Havermans.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 7 (as well as new dependent claim 19) are patentable over the cited art of record.

In its rejection of claim 16, the Office Action asserts that column 6, lines 65-67 and 1-5 (presumably of column 7) of Sugar teach the features of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Namely, as recited in claim 16, the plurality of reception buffer stages are configured to handle both data underflow and data overflow, without loss of data, due to different sampling clock rates output by the respective sampling clock generator provided in the first and second terminals. (emphasis added). Turning now to Sugar, column 6, lines 65-67 and column 7, lines 1-5 of that reference merely describe that a Voice Codeword FIFO empties after a packet is decoded, causing low-level white noise to be generated until the arrival of another packet, and whereby once the another packet arrives, the Voice Codeword FIFO size is set to 1.3 packets to replicate the correct silence interval between the two voice segments. This says nothing about using different sampling clock rates for different reception buffer stages. Column 7, lines 5-7 of Sugar states that the local packet clock is allowed to free-run instead of being reinitialized, but again this does not change the sampling clock rate for different buffer stages; rather, the same clock rate is used for the buffer stages in the system of Sugar.

Accordingly, since the other cited art of record does not rectify the above-mentioned shortcomings of Sugar, as acknowledged in the Office Action, dependent claim 16 is patentable over the cited art of record.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 28, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck  
Registration No. 38,072  
  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819